

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Following entry of the amendments, pending claims are 1, 7, 8, 10-13, 15-19, 21-23, and 27-41. Claims 2-6, 9, 14, 20, and 24-26 are cancelled. Dependent claims 28-41 are new.

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Chantrain et al. and Natarajan et al. is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the claims as amended define subject matter patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 1, 13 and 21 require the use of scripts to populate a configuration template with data stored in a vendor-independent network database. The use of scripts permits vendor-specific logic and vendor-independent database enables support of network elements from different vendors using a data-drive model. See specification at paragraph 0049. Chantrain et al. and Natarajan et al. do not appear to mention or appreciate a problem of supporting in an automated configuration processor or system equipment form different vendors, much less suggest how to address the problem, including the solution set forth in claims 1, 13 and 21. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 13 and 21, as amended, are distinguishable over the cited references and the other prior art of record.

In view of claims 1, 13 and 21 being patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, it is submitted that all claims depending from them are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, their rejections are moot.

In the rejection independent claim 27, the examiner repeats the elements claims and states only that “Chantrain-Natarajan” teaches those elements, without citing providing any reasoning other than citing lines 35-50 from col. 31 of Natarajan et al. However, these lines appear to address only about a CIR policy monitor process shown in Fig. 17. There is no mention of a computer readable storage medium that stores metadata describing network elements and fields defined for storing configuration data described by the metadata. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner has not met his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness by providing explicit analysis and reasoning.

Each new claim 28-41 is allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which it depends are allowable, as well as for the combination of its additional limitations with those of the independent claim from which it depends is not found or suggested by the prior art of record.

In view of claims 1, 13 and 21 being patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record, it is submitted that all claims depending from them are patentable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, their respective rejection, as well as the reasoning supporting it, is moot. In view of the rejections being moot, applicants have elected not to address the errors contained in the specific reasoning provided by the examiner in support of the rejection of each claims. The failure to address any specific reasoning should not be construed as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the reasoning.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application. Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees due but not submitted with this paper to Deposit Account No. 07-0153. The examiner is respectfully requested to call applicants' attorney for any reasons that would advance the current application to issue. Please reference Attorney Docket No. 131195-1003.

Respectfully submitted,

GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP

/Marc A. Hubbard/

Marc A. Hubbard
Registration No. 32,506
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Date: March 20, 2009

3000 Thanksgiving Tower
1601 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761
(214) 999-4880 - Telephone
(214) 999-3880 - Facsimile